arXiv:math/0402424v1 [math.QA] 26 Feb 2004

Structure of a new class of non-graded infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras[1]

(appeared in *J. Algebra* **267** (2003) 542-558)

Yucai Su
Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200030, P. R. China
Email: ycsu@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

A new class of infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras over a field with characteristic 0 are constructed. These are examples of non-graded Lie algebras. The isomorphism classes of these Lie algebras are determined. The structure space of these algebras is given explicitly.

§1. Introduction

Block [1] introduced a class of infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras over a field with characteristic zero. Since then (and in particular recently), infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras with some features of Block algebras have received some authors' interests (see for example [2-7,10-11,13-16,18-20]). This is probably partially because the Block algebras are closely related to the (centerless) Virasoro algebra (for example, [19,20]).

One observes that the classical Block algebras $\mathcal{B}$ are graded Lie algebras, i.e., $\mathcal{B}$ can be finitely graded: $\mathcal{B} = \oplus_{\alpha\in\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_\alpha, [\mathcal{B}_\alpha, \mathcal{B}_\beta] \subset \mathcal{B}_{\alpha+\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$, where Γ is some Abelian group Γ such that all homogeneous spaces $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ are finite dimensional. It is pointed out in [17] that non-graded infinite dimensional Lie algebras appear naturally in the theory of Hamiltonian operators, the theory of vertex algebras and their multi-variable analogues; that they play important roles in mathematical physics; that the structure spaces of some families of non-graded simple Lie algebras can be viewed as analogues of vector bundles with Lie algebras as fibers and it is also believed that some of non-graded simple Lie algebras could be related to noncommutative geometry.

The key constructional ingredients of the non-graded infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras in [17] are locally finite derivations. In this paper, based on the classification [9] of the pairs $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a commutative associative algebra with an identity element and $\mathcal{D}$ is a finite dimensional commutative subalgebra of locally finite derivations

---

[1] AMS Subject Classification-Primary: 17B40, 17B65, 17B70

Supported by a NSF grant 10171064 of China and two research grants from Ministry of Education of China

of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ does not have a proper $\mathcal{D}$-stable ideal, we shall present another new class of non-graded infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras which have some features of Block algebras. These Lie algebras can also be viewed as further generalizations of Xu's algebras [15].

Throughout the paper, let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field with characteristic 0 (in Section 3, we require that $\mathbb{F}$ is algebraically closd). Denote the ring of integers by $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\{0,1,2,...\}$ by $\mathbb{N}$. Up to equivalence of constructions, we can construct the new Lie algebras as follows. Let Γ be an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{F}^4$. An element in Γ is written as $\alpha=(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_4)$. Let $\pi_p:\Gamma\to\mathbb{F}$ be the natural projection $\pi_p:\alpha\mapsto\alpha_p$ for $p=1,2,3,4$. We shall assume that Γ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\sigma=(1,0,1,0)\in\Gamma,\ \delta=(0,0,\delta_3,0)\in\Gamma,\ \text{and } \ker_{\pi_4}\not\subset\ker_{\pi_2} \text{ if } \pi_2\neq0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\delta_3\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$ is a fixed number. Pick

$$J_p=\{0\} \text{ or } \mathbb{N} \text{ for } p=1,2,3,4 \text{ such that } J_q\neq\{0\} \text{ if } \pi_q=0 \text{ for } q=2,4. \tag{1.2}$$

Set $J=J_1\times J_2\times J_3\times J_4$. An element in J will be written as $\vec{i}=(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)$. Denote by $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}(\Gamma,J)$ the semigroup algebra of $\Gamma\times J$ with basis $\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,(\alpha,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times J\}$ and the algebraic operation:

$$x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}x^{\beta,\vec{j}}=x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}} \text{ for } (\alpha,\vec{i}),(\beta,\vec{j})\in\Gamma\times J. \tag{1.3}$$

Denote the identity element $x^{0,0}$ simply by 1. Denote

$$a_{[1]}=(a,0,0,0),\ a_{[2]}=(0,a,0,0),\ a_{[3]}=(0,0,a,0),\ a_{[4]}=(0,0,0,a) \text{ for } a\in\mathbb{F}. \tag{1.4}$$

Define derivations ∂_p of $\mathcal{A}$ by

$$\partial_p(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}})=\alpha_p x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}+i_p x^{\alpha,\vec{i}-1_{[p]}} \text{ for } (\alpha,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times J \text{ and } p=1,2,3,4, \tag{1.5}$$

where we always treat $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}=0$ if $\vec{i}\notin J$.

We define the following algebraic operation $[\cdot,\cdot]$ on $\mathcal{A}$

$$[u,v]=x^{\sigma,0}(\partial_1(u)\partial_2(v)-\partial_1(v)\partial_2(u))+(x^{\delta,0}\partial_3(u)+u)\partial_4(v)-\partial_4(u)(x^{\delta,0}\partial_3(v)+v), \tag{1.6}$$

for $u,v\in\mathcal{A}$. It can be verified that $(\mathcal{A},[\cdot,\cdot])$ forms a Lie algebra. Denote by $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}(\Gamma,J,\delta)=[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}]$ the derived subalgebras of $(\mathcal{A},[\cdot,\cdot])$.

We shall prove the simplicity of $\mathcal{B}$ and present some interesting examples in Section 2, then determine the isomorphism classes and the structure space of the Lie algebras $\mathcal{B}$ in Section 3.

§2. Simplicity theorem and examples

By (1.6), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
[x^{\alpha,\vec{i}},x^{\beta,\vec{j}}] = {}&(\alpha_1\beta_2-\beta_1\alpha_2)x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{j}}+(\alpha_1j_2-\beta_1i_2)x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[2]}}\\
&+(i_1\beta_2-j_1\alpha_2)x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[1]}}+(i_1j_2-j_1i_2)x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[1]}-1_{[2]}}\\
&+(\alpha_3\beta_4-\beta_3\alpha_4)x^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}}+(\alpha_3j_4-\beta_3i_4)x^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[4]}}\\
&+(i_3\beta_4-j_3\alpha_4)x^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[3]}}+(i_3j_4-j_3i_4)x^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[3]}-1_{[4]}}\\
&+(\beta_4-\alpha_4)x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}}+(j_4-i_4)x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[4]}},
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.1}
$$

for $(\alpha,\vec{i}),(\beta,\vec{j})\in\Gamma\times J$. In particular,

$$
\begin{aligned}
[1,x^{\beta,\vec{j}}] &= \beta_4x^{\beta,\vec{j}}+j_4x^{\beta,\vec{j}-1_{[4]}} \text{ for } (\beta,\vec{j})\in\Gamma\times J, &(2.2)\\
[x^{-\sigma},x^{\beta,\vec{j}}] &= -\beta_2x^{\beta,\vec{j}}-j_2x^{\beta,\vec{j}-1_{[2]}} \text{ if } \beta_4=j_4=0, &(2.3)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in general, we denote $x^\alpha=x^{\alpha,0}$, $t^{\vec{i}}=x^{0,\vec{i}}$, $t_p=t^{1_{[p]}}$, $p=1,2,3,4$ (then $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}=x^\alpha t^{\vec{i}}$ and $t^{\vec{i}}=\prod_{p=1}^4t_p^{i_p}$). For $\lambda\in\pi_4(\Gamma),m\in\mathbb{N}$, define

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{B}_\lambda^{(m)}=\{u\in\mathcal{B}\,|\,(\mathrm{ad}_1-\lambda)^{m+1}(u)=0\}=\mathcal{B}\bigcap\mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,\alpha_4=\lambda,i_4\le m\},\\
&\mathcal{B}^{(m)}=\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\pi_4(\Gamma)}\mathcal{B}_\lambda^{(m)},\ \ \mathcal{B}_\lambda=\bigcup_{m=0}^\infty\mathcal{B}_\lambda^{(m)},\ \ \text{then } \mathcal{B}=\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\pi_4(\Gamma)}\mathcal{B}_\lambda.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.4}
$$

Theorem 2.1. *The Lie algebra* $(\mathcal{B},[\cdot,\cdot])$ *is simple. Furthermore,* $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A}$ *if* $J_p\ne\{0\}$ *for some* $p\in\{1,2,4\}$, *and if* $J_1=J_2=J_4=\{0\}$, $\mathcal{B}$ *is spanned by the elements:*

$$
\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}},x^{\beta,\vec{i}},\gamma_3x^{\gamma+\delta,\vec{i}}+i_3x^{\gamma+\delta,\vec{i}-1_{[3]}}+2x^{\gamma,\vec{i}}\,|\,(\alpha_2,\alpha_4)\ne0=(\beta_2,\beta_4)=(\gamma_2,\gamma_4),\beta_1\ne1=\gamma_1\}. \tag{2.5}
$$

Proof. If $J_4\ne\{0\}$, (2.2) and induction on i_4 show that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}}\in[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}],\forall(\beta,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times J$, so $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A}$. If $J_4=\{0\}\ne J_2$, (2.2) shows that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{B}$ if $\beta_4\ne0$, (2.3) and induction on i_2 show that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{B}$ if $\beta_4=0$. Assume that $J_2=J_4=\{0\}$. Then $\pi_2\ne0\ne\pi_4$ by (1.2), and (2.2), (2.3) show that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{B}$ if $(\beta_2,\beta_4)\ne0$. If $(\beta_2,\beta_4)=0$, for any $\alpha\in\Gamma$ with $(\alpha_2,\alpha_4)\ne0$, we have

$$
[x^{-\alpha},x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}}]=\alpha_2(\beta_1x^{\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}}+i_1x^{\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}-1_{[1]}})+\alpha_4(\beta_3x^{\beta+\delta,\vec{i}}+i_3x^{\beta+\delta,\vec{i}-1_{[3]}}+2x^{\beta,\vec{i}}). \tag{2.6}
$$

By the last condition of (1.1), we can choose α with $\alpha_2\ne0=\alpha_4$, thus the first term of the right-hand side is in $\mathcal{B}$, from this we see that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{B}$ if $J_1\ne\{0\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A}$. Assume that $J_1=\{0\}$. Using (1.2) and the last condition of (1.1), we see that both terms of the right-hand side of (2.6) are in $\mathcal{B}$, from this we see that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{B}$ if $\beta_1\ne1$ and thus (2.5) is contained in $\mathcal{B}$. Conversely, suppose $J_1=J_2=J_4=\{0\}$. Then the only possible 4 nonzero terms in the right-hand side of (2.1) are the 1st, 5th, 7th, 9th terms. If $(\alpha_2+\beta_2,\alpha_4+\beta_4)\neq 0$ or $\alpha_1+\beta_1\neq 0,1$, all these terms are in (2.5). Assume that $(\alpha_2+\beta_2,\alpha_4+\beta_4)=0$ and $\alpha_1+\beta_1=0,1$. If $\alpha_1+\beta_1=0$, then the 1st term is zero and the other 3 terms are in (2.5); if $\alpha_1+\beta_1=1$, then the 1st term and the sum of other 3 term are in (2.5). Thus we have (2.5). This proves the second statement of the theorem. In particular in any case, we have

$$x^{i\sigma}, x^{j\delta}\in\mathcal{B} \text{ for } i,j\in\mathbb{Z},\ i\neq 1. \tag{2.7}$$

Suppose $\mathcal{I}\neq\{0\}$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{B}$. We prove $\mathcal{I}=\mathcal{B}$. First we want to prove $1\in\mathcal{I}$. Since any ideal is invariant under ad_1, by (2.2), $\mathcal{I}=\oplus_{\lambda\in\pi_4(\Gamma)}\mathcal{I}_\lambda$, where $\mathcal{I}_\lambda=\mathcal{I}\cap\mathcal{B}_\lambda$, and $\mathcal{I}_\lambda\neq\{0\}\Leftrightarrow\mathcal{I}_\lambda^{(0)}=\mathcal{I}\cap\mathcal{B}_\lambda^{(0)}\neq\{0\}$. Thus $\mathcal{I}_\lambda^{(0)}\neq\{0\}$ for some λ. Pick $u\in\mathcal{I}_\lambda^{(0)}\backslash\{0\}$ and we can write

$$u=\sum_{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0}c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}x^{\alpha,\vec{i}},\ \text{where } M_0=\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times J\,|\,\alpha_4=i_4=0,c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}\} \text{ is finite.} \tag{2.8}$$

If $\lambda\neq 0$, by taking $(\beta,\vec{j})\in M_0$ and replacing u by $[x^{-\beta},u]$ (it is easy to see that it is nonzero), we can suppose $\lambda=0$. Applying $\mathrm{ad}_{x^{-\sigma}}$ to u (note that $x^{-\sigma}\in\mathcal{B}$ by (2.7)), using (2.3), we see that there exists an element, again denoted by u, such that $\alpha_2=\eta, i_2=0$ if $(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0$, for some $\eta\in\pi_2(\Gamma)$.

Case 1: $\pi_2\neq 0$. If necessary by replacing u by $[x^\beta,u]\in\mathcal{I}\backslash\{0\}$ for some $\beta\in\Gamma$ with $\beta_2\neq 0=\beta_4$ (cf. the last condition of (1.1)), we can suppose $\eta\neq 0$. Denote $\Gamma(u)=\{\alpha_1\in\pi_1(\Gamma)\,|\,\exists(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0\}$, and denote by $|\Gamma(u)|$ the size of $\Gamma(u)$. Pick $(\gamma,\vec{k})\in M_0$. Denote $J_\gamma(u)=\{i_1\in J_1\,|\,\exists(\gamma,\vec{i})\in M_0\}$. Let $v=[x^{\gamma,\vec{k}},u]$. Note that by (2.1),

$$[x^{\gamma,\vec{k}},x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}]=\eta((\gamma_1-\alpha_1)x^{\alpha+\gamma+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{k}}+(k_1-i_1)x^{\alpha+\gamma+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}}) \text{ for } (\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0. \tag{2.9}$$

This shows that

$$\Gamma(v)=\{\alpha_1+\gamma_1+1\,|\,\alpha_1\in\Gamma(u)\} \text{ if } |J_\gamma(u)|>1 \text{ or } \{\alpha_1+\gamma_1+1\,|\,\gamma_1\neq\alpha_1\in\Gamma(u)\} \text{ if } |J_\gamma(u)|=1,$$
$$J_{2\gamma+\sigma}(v)=\{i+k-1\,|\,k\neq i\in J_\gamma(u)\},$$

so $|\Gamma(v)|=|\Gamma(u)|$ if $|J_\gamma(u)|>1$ or $|\Gamma(v)|=|\Gamma(u)|-1$ if $|J_\gamma(u)|=1$, and $|J_{2\gamma+\sigma}(v)|=|J_\gamma(u)|-1$. Thus by replacing u by v and repeating the above arguments, we can find an element u such that $|\Gamma(u)|=1$ and $|J_\gamma(u)|=1$ for some γ, that is, $M_0=\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0\,|\,\alpha_1=\gamma_1,i_1=j\}$ for some $j\in J_1$. If $j\neq 0$, replacing u by $v=[x^\gamma,u]$ and repeating, noting that now $[x^\gamma,x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}]=-\eta j x^{\alpha+\gamma+\sigma,\vec{i}-1_{[1]}}$ for $(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0$ (cf. (2.9)), we can find an element $u\in\mathcal{I}$ such that in (2.8), $M_0=\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0\,|\,(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_4)=(\gamma_1,\eta,0),(i_1,i_2,i_4)=$

$0\}$. Now taking $(\beta,\vec{j}) \in M_0$ and replacing u by $[x^{-\beta-\sigma},u]$, we see that u has the form (2.8) with $M_0 = \{(\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0 \,|\, (\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_4) = (i_1,i_2,i_4) = 0\}$.

Subcase (i): $\pi_4 \neq 0$. By taking $\beta \in \Gamma$ with $\beta_4 \neq 0$ and replacing u by $[x^\beta,u]$, we can suppose $M_0 = \{(\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0 \,|\, (\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_4) = (\beta_1,\beta_2,\beta_4), (i_1,i_2,i_4) = 0\}$. Pick $(\gamma,\vec{k}) \in M_0$ and we have

$$[x^{\gamma,\vec{k}},x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}] = \beta_4((\gamma_3-\alpha_3)x^{\gamma+\alpha+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{k}} + (k_3-i_3)x^{\gamma+\alpha+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[3]}}) \text{ for } (\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0. \tag{2.10}$$

Thus using the same arguments as in (2.9), we can find an element, again denoted by u such that M_0 is a singleton $\{(\alpha,0)\}$ for some α with $\alpha_4 \neq 0$, i.e., u is a scalar of x^α. Thus $1 = (2\alpha_4)^{-1}[x^{-\alpha},x^\alpha] \in \mathcal{I}$.

Subcase (ii): $\pi_4 = 0$. By replacing u by $[t^{2_{[4]}},u]$, we can suppose $M_0 = \{(\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0 \,|\, (\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_4) = 0, (i_1,i_2,i_4) = (0,0,1)\}$. Note that

$$[x^{\gamma,\vec{k}},x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}] = (\gamma_3-\alpha_3)x^{\gamma+\alpha+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[4]}} + (k_3-i_3)x^{\gamma+\alpha+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[3]}-1_{[4]}} \text{ for } (\gamma,\vec{k}),(\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0. \tag{2.11}$$

Thus again using similar arguments as above we obtain $1 \in \mathcal{I}$.

Case 2: $\pi_2 = 0$. By replacing u by $[t^{2_{[2]}},u]$, we can suppose $M_0 = \{(\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0 \,|\, \alpha_4 = i_4 = 0, i_2 = 1\}$. Then similar to (2.9), we have

$$[x^{\gamma,\vec{k}},x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}] = (\gamma_1-\alpha_1)x^{\gamma+\alpha+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[2]}} + (k_1-i_1)x^{\gamma+\alpha+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}-1_{[2]}} \text{ for } (\gamma,\vec{k}),(\alpha,\vec{i}) \in M_0, \tag{2.12}$$

and as above, we can deduce $1 \in \mathcal{I}$.

Thus we have $1 \in \mathcal{I}$. Then by (2.2), we have $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}$ if $J_4 \neq \{0\}$. Suppose $J_4 = \{0\}$. (2.2) shows that $x^{\beta,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{I}$ if $\beta_4 \neq 0$, and then by letting $\alpha \in \Gamma$ with $\alpha_4 = 0$ and calculating the coefficient of k in $[x^{\beta-(k+1)\sigma},x^{-\beta+k\sigma+\alpha,\vec{i}}] \in \mathcal{I}$, it gives $\alpha_2 x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} + i_2 x^{\alpha,\vec{i}-1_{[2]}} \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{I}$ if $J_2 \neq \{0\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}$. Suppose $J_2 = \{0\}$. Then $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{I}$ if $\alpha_2 \neq 0$. If $\alpha_2 = 0$, by taking $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma_2 \neq 0 = \gamma_4$ and calculating the coefficient of k in $[x^{k\gamma},x^{-k\gamma+\alpha-\sigma,\vec{i}}] \in \mathcal{I}$, it gives $(\alpha_1-1)x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} + i_1 x^{\alpha,\vec{i}-1_{[1]}} \in \mathcal{I}$. This shows that $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{I}$ if $J_1 \neq \{0\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}$, and that $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{I}$ if $\alpha_1 \neq 1$ and $J_1 = \{0\}$. From this and (2.6), we obtain that elements in (2.5) are all in $\mathcal{I}$. Thus in any case $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}$, i.e., $\mathcal{B}$ is simple. ∎

Example 2.2. By Theorem 2.1, we obtain the following examples of simple Lie algebras $\mathcal{B}$, where symbol f_t denotes the partial derivative of a polynomial f with respect to the variable t, and where $m \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ is any fixed number, $a,b,c \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$ are any fixed non-rational numbers in $\mathbb{F}$, and $f,g \in \mathcal{B}$.

(1) Let $\Gamma = \{(i,0,k,0) \,|\, i,k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $J = \{(0,j,0,l) \,|\, j,l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\delta = (0,0,m,0)$. Let $x_1 = x^{(1,0,0,0)}, x_3 = x^{(0,0,1,0)}$, then $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{F}[x_1^{\pm 1}, t_2, x_3^{\pm 1}, t_4]$ and the Lie bracket is:

$$[f,g] = x_1^2 x_3 (f_{x_1} g_{t_2} - f_{t_2} g_{x_1}) + (x_3^{m+1} f_{x_3} + f) g_{t_4} - f_{t_4} (x_3^{m+1} g_{x_3} + g). \tag{2.13}$$

(2) Let $\Gamma = \{(i,j,k,l) \,|\, i,j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $J = \{0\}$, $\delta = (0,0,m,0)$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{F}[x_p^{\pm 1} \,|\, p = 1,2,3,4]$. Then $\mathcal{B} = \{x_1^{n_1} x_2^{n_2} x_3^{n_3} x_4^{n_4}, x_1^{p_1} x_3^{p_3}, x_1(q x_3^{q+m} + 2x_3^q) \,|\, n_1, ..., n_4, p_1, p_3, q \in \mathbb{Z}, (n_2, n_4) \neq 0, p_1 \neq 1\}$ with the bracket

$$[f,g] = x_1^2 x_2 x_3 (f_{x_1} g_{x_2} - f_{x_2} g_{x_1}) + x_4((x_3^{m+1} f_{x_3} + f) g_{x_4} - f_{x_4} (x_3^{m+1} g_{x_3} + g)). \tag{2.14}$$

(3) Let $\Gamma = \{(i,0,i+ak,0) \,|\, i,k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $J = \{(0,j,0,l) \,|\, j,l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\delta = (0,0,am,0)$. Let $x_1 = x^{(1,0,1,0)}, x_3 = x^{(0,0,a,0)}$. Then $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{F}[x_1^{\pm 1}, t_2, x_3^{\pm 1}, t_4]$ with the bracket

$$[f,g] = x_1^2 (f_{x_1} g_{t_2} - f_{t_2} g_{x_1}) + (x_3^m (x_1 f_{x_1} + a x_3 f_{x_3}) + f) g_{t_4} - f_{t_4} (x_3^m (x_1 g_{x_1} + a x_3 g_{x_3}) + g). \tag{2.15}$$

(4) Let $\Gamma = \{(i+al, j, i+bj+ck, l) \,|\, i,j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $J = \{(0,0,0,l) \,|\, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\delta = (0,0,bm,0)$. Let $x_1 = x^{(1,0,1,0)}, x_2 = x^{(0,1,b,0)}, x_3 = x^{(0,0,c,0)}, x_4 = x^{(a,0,0,1)}$. Then $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{F}[x_p^{\pm 1}, t_4 \,|\, p = 1,2,3,4]$ with the bracket

$$\begin{aligned}[f,g] = {} & x_1 x_2 ((x_1 f_{x_1} + a x_4 f_{x_4}) g_{x_2} - f_{x_2} (x_1 g_{x_1} + a x_4 g_{x_4})) \\ & + (x_3^m (x_1 f_{x_1} + b x_2 f_{x_2} + c x_3 f_{x_3}) + f)(x_4 g_{x_4} + g_{t_4}) \\ & - (x_4 f_{x_4} + f_{t_4})(x_3^m (x_1 f_{x_1} + b x_2 g_{x_2} + c x_3 g_{x_3}) + g).\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

§3. Isomorphism classes and the structure space

In this section, we shall assume that $\mathbb{F}$ is an algebraically closed field with characteristic zero. To give the structure space, let $M = \{\vec{m} = (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \,|\, m_p = 0, 1,\ p = 1,2,3,4\}$ be a set of 16 elements corresponding to all possible choices of J. For $\vec{m} \in M$, $a \in \mathbb{F} \backslash \{0\}$, let $\Omega_{\vec{m},a}$ be the set of subgroups Γ of $\mathbb{F}^4$, where Γ satisfies the following conditions:

$$(1,0,1,0), (0,0,a,0) \in \Gamma;\ \ker_{\pi_4} \not\subset \ker_{\pi_2} \text{ if } \pi_2 \neq 0;\ \pi_p \neq 0 \text{ if } m_p = 0 \text{ for } p = 2,4. \tag{3.1}$$

Let $G_{\vec{m},a}$ be the group of invertible 4×4 matrices of the form $\begin{pmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a_1 & a_2 \end{smallmatrix} & 0 \\ 0 & \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a_3 & a_4 \end{smallmatrix} \end{pmatrix}$ such that $a_1 = 0$ if $m_1 = 0 \neq m_2$, and $a_3 = 0$ if $m_3 = 0 \neq m_4$. Then $G_{\vec{m},a}$ acts on $\Omega_{\vec{m},a}$ via $g(\Gamma) = \{\alpha g^{-1} \,|\, \alpha \in \Gamma\} \in \Omega_{\vec{m},a}$ for $g \in G_{\vec{m},a}, \Gamma \in \Omega_{\vec{m},a}$. We define the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{m},a} = \Omega_{\vec{m},a} / G_{\vec{m},a}$, the set of $G_{\vec{m},a}$-orbits in $\Omega_{\vec{m},a}$.

Theorem 3.1. *The Lie algebras* $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\Gamma, J, \delta)$ *and* $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}(\Gamma', J', \delta')$ *are isomorphic* $\Leftrightarrow$ $(J, \delta) = (J', \delta')$ *and* $\exists\, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{F}$ *with* $a_2, a_4 \neq 0$*, and* $a_1 = 0$ *if* $J_1 = \{0\} \neq J_2$*,* *and* $a_3 = 0$ *if* $J_3 = \{0\} \neq J_4$*, such that the map*

$$\tau : \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4) \mapsto \beta' = \beta \begin{pmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a_1 & a_2 \end{smallmatrix} & 0 \\ 0 & \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a_3 & a_4 \end{smallmatrix} \end{pmatrix} = (\beta_1 + a_1\beta_2, a_2\beta_2, \beta_3 + a_3\beta_4, a_4\beta_4), \qquad (3.2)$$

is a group isomorphism $\Gamma \cong \Gamma'$*. Thus there is a bijection between the isomorphism classes of the simple Lie algebras* $\mathcal{B}$ *and the set:*

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(\vec{m}, a, \omega) \mid \vec{m} \in M, a \in \mathbb{F} \backslash \{0\}, \omega \in \mathcal{M}_{\vec{m},a}\}, \qquad (3.3)$$

i.e., $\mathcal{M}$ *is the structure space of these simple Lie algebras.*

Proof. We shall ALWAYS use the symbol y in place of x for the algebra $\mathcal{B}'$ and use the same notation with a prime to denote any other element associated with $\mathcal{B}'$.

"$\Leftarrow$": We define two algebra structures (not necessarily associative) $(\mathcal{A}, \odot_1)$ and $(\mathcal{A}, \odot_2)$ by $u \odot_1 v = x^\sigma \partial_1(u)\partial_2(v)$, $u \odot_2 v = (x^\delta \partial_3(u) + u)\partial_4(v)$, then $[u, v] = [u, v]_1 + [u, v]_2$, where $[u, v]_p = u \odot_p v - v \odot_p u$ for $p = 1, 2$. First define a multiplicative function $\chi : \Gamma \to \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$ such that $\chi(\sigma) = a_2 a_4^{-1}, \chi(\delta) = 1$. We prove that such a function exists: suppose Δ is the maximal subgroup of Γ containing $\{\sigma, \delta\}$ such that such a function exists for Δ. If $\Delta \neq \Gamma$, choose $\beta \in \Gamma\backslash\Delta$. If $\exists\, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha = n\beta \in \Delta$, then we define $\chi(\beta) = \chi(\alpha)^{1/n}$ (since $\mathbb{F}$ is algebraically closed, we can take any nth root), otherwise we set $\chi(\beta) = 1$. Then χ extends to a function on the group generated by Δ and β, which contradicts the maximality of Δ.

Define $\theta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}'$ by

$$\theta(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}) = a_4^{-1}\chi(\alpha) y^{\alpha'} (t_1')^{i_1} (a_1 t_1' + a_2 t_2')^{i_2} (t_3')^{i_3} (a_3 t_3' + a_4 t_4')^{i_4}, \qquad (3.4)$$

where $\alpha' = \tau(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma$. Note that if $J_1 = \{0\} \neq J_2$, by assumption $a_1 = 0$ and so t_1' does not appear in $\theta(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}})$; similarly, t_3' does not occur if $J_3 = \{0\} \neq J_4$. We want to prove

$$[\theta(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}), \theta(x^{\beta,\vec{j}})]_p = \theta([x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}, x^{\beta,\vec{j}}])_p \text{ for } p = 1, 2. \qquad (3.5)$$

Say $p = 2$ and assume that $i_3 + j_3, i_4 + j_4 > 0$ (otherwise, the proof is easier). We have

$$x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \odot_2 x^{\beta,\vec{j}} = x^{\alpha+\beta, \vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[3]}-1_{[4]}} (x^\delta(\alpha_3 t_3 + i_3) + t_3)(\beta_4 t_4 + j_4). \qquad (3.6)$$

First we will calculate $\theta(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \odot_2 x^{\beta,\vec{j}})$. By (3.6) and that $\chi(\delta) = 1$ and τ maps δ to δ, $\theta(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \odot_2 x^{\beta,\vec{j}})$ can be written as the product of the term

$$a_4^{-1}\chi(\alpha+\beta) y^{\alpha'+\beta'} (t_1')^{i_1+j_1} (a_1 t_1' + a_2 t_2')^{i_2+j_2} (t_3')^{i_3+j_3-1} (a_3 t_3' + a_4 t_4')^{i_4+j_4-2}, \qquad (3.7)$$

with the term

$$(a_3t'_3+a_4t'_4)(y^\delta(\alpha_3t'_3+i_3)+t'_3)(\beta_4(a_3t'_3+a_4t'_4)+j_4), \tag{3.8}$$

(note that $\theta(x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[3]}-1_{[4]}})$ is (3.7) multiplied by the first factor of (3.8)). Similarly, $\theta(x^{\alpha,\vec{i}})\odot_2\theta(x^{\beta,\vec{j}})$ is (3.7) multiplied by

$$a_4^{-1}((y^\delta(\alpha'_3t'_3+i_3)+t'_3)(a_3t'_3+a_4t'_4)+i_4a_3t'_3y^\delta)(\beta'_4(a_3t'_3+a_4t'_4)+a_4j_4), \tag{3.9}$$

which is arisen from $(y^\delta\partial'_3+1)(y^{\alpha'}(t'_3)^{i_3}(a_3t'_3+a_4t'_4)^{i_4})$ and $\partial'_4(y^{\beta'}(a_3t'_3+a_4t'_4)^{j_4})$. Denote by $D(\alpha,\beta)$ the difference of (3.8) from (3.9), then (3.5) is equivalent to $D(\alpha,\beta)-D(\beta,\alpha)=0$, which can be verified directly by using $\alpha'_3=\alpha_3+a_3\alpha_4,\alpha'_4=a_4\alpha_4$. Thus θ induces an isomorphism $\theta:(\mathcal{B},[\cdot,\cdot])\cong(\mathcal{B}',[\cdot,\cdot])$.

"$\Rightarrow$": Suppose $\theta:\mathcal{B}\cong\mathcal{B}'$ is an isomorphism. For a Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_F$ the set of *ad*-locally finite elements of $\mathcal{L}$. The isomorphism θ maps $\mathcal{B}_F$ onto $\mathcal{B}'_F$. First we determine $\mathcal{B}_F$.

Claim 1. (i) $\mathcal{B}_F=\mathbb{F}$ if $\pi_4\neq 0$; (ii) $\mathcal{B}_F=\mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,i_2=i_4=0\}$ if $\pi_2=\pi_4=0$; (iii) $\mathcal{B}_F=\mathrm{span}\{x^{-\sigma},x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,\alpha=(\alpha_3)_{[3]},\vec{i}=(i_3)_{[3]}\}$ (cf. (1.4)) if $\pi_2\neq 0=\pi_4$; (iv) $\mathrm{ad}_{\mathbb{F}}$ are locally nilpotent $\Leftrightarrow\pi_4=0$.

In each case, the set involved is an abelian Lie subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}$ and it is easy to verify that each term in the set is *ad*-locally finite, and that $\mathrm{ad}_{\mathbb{F}}$ are locally-nilpotent $\Leftrightarrow\pi_4=0$. Now suppose $u\in\mathcal{B}$ is *ad*-locally finite. Write $u=\sum_{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0}c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}$, where $M_0=\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times J\,|\,c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}\neq 0\}$. Set $\Gamma(u)=\{\alpha\in\Gamma\,|\,\exists(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0\}$. Choose a total order on Γ compatible with the group structure such that either $\delta>\sigma>0$ or $\delta<\sigma<0$. This is possible since δ,σ are $\mathbb{F}$-linear independent. Let γ be the maximal element in $\Gamma(u)$.

(i) Suppose $\pi_4\neq 0$. If $\exists\,\alpha\in\Gamma(u)$ such that $(\alpha_3,\alpha_4)\neq 0$, by reversing the order of Γ if necessary we assume that $(\gamma_3,\gamma_4)\neq 0$; otherwise we assume that $\delta<\sigma<0$. Define a total order on $\Gamma\times J:(\alpha,\vec{i})<(\beta,\vec{j})\Leftrightarrow\alpha<\beta$ or $\alpha=\beta,|\vec{i}|<|\vec{j}|$ or $(\alpha,|\vec{i}|)=(\beta,|\vec{j}|)$ but $\exists\,p,\ i_p<j_p$ and $i_q=j_q,q<p$, where $|\vec{i}|=\sum_{p=1}^4 i_p$. Let $(\gamma,\vec{k})$ be the maximal element in M_0. We call $c_{\gamma,\vec{k}}x^{\gamma,\vec{k}}$ the *leading term* of u. We may assume $c_{\gamma,\vec{k}}=1$. Assume that $(\gamma,\vec{k})\neq 0$. If $\delta<\sigma<0$, we choose $\eta\in\Gamma$ such that $\eta_4+p\gamma_4\neq 0$, $\forall\,p\geq 0$, then the leading term of $\mathrm{ad}_u^q(x^{\eta+\gamma})$ is $\prod_{p=0}^{q-1}(\eta_4+p\gamma_4)x^{\eta+(q+1)\gamma,q\vec{k}}$, and $\dim(\mathrm{span}\{\mathrm{ad}_u^q(x^{\eta+\gamma})\,|\,q\in\mathbb{N}\})=\infty$, so u is not *ad*-locally finite. If $\delta>\sigma>0$, then $(\gamma_3,\gamma_4)\neq 0$, and so we can choose $\eta\in\Gamma$ such that

$$b_p=\gamma_3(\eta_4+p\gamma_4)-\gamma_4(\eta_3+p(\gamma_3+\delta_3))=\gamma_3\eta_4-\gamma_4\eta_3-p\delta_3\gamma_4\neq 0,\ \forall\,p\geq 0, \tag{3.10}$$

then the leading term of $\mathrm{ad}_u^q(x^\eta)$ is $\prod_{p=0}^{q-1}b_px^{\eta+q(\gamma+\sigma),q\vec{k}}$, and so u is not *ad*-locally finite. Thus $\mathcal{B}_F=\mathbb{F}$.

(ii) Suppose $\pi_2 = \pi_4 = 0$. First assume that $\exists\,(\alpha, \vec{i}) \in M_0$ such that $i_4 \neq 0$, we define a total order on $\Gamma \times J$: $(\alpha, \vec{i}) < (\beta, \vec{j}) \Leftrightarrow (i_4, \alpha, i_1, i_2, i_3) < (j_4, \beta, j_1, j_2, j_3)$ (the later is the lexicographical order). Let $(\beta, \vec{k})$ be the maximal element in M_0. Then $k_4 > 0$. If $\exists\,\alpha \neq 0, (\alpha, \vec{k}) \in M_0$, we choose the order of Γ such that $\beta > 0$; otherwise we choose the order of Γ such that $\delta < \sigma < 0$. First suppose $(\beta, \vec{k} - 1_{[4]}) \neq 0$. If $\delta < \sigma < 0$, the leading term of $\mathrm{ad}_u^q(t^{(2k_4)_{[4]}})$ is $\prod_{p=0}^{q-1}(k_4 + p(k_4 - 1))x^{q\beta, 2\vec{k}+q(\vec{k}-1_{[4]})}$ and u is not *ad*-locally finite. If $\delta > \sigma > 0$, then $\beta > 0$ and we choose $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$b_p = \beta_3 p(k_4 - 1) - k_4(n\beta_3 + p(\beta_3 + \delta_3)) = -nk_4\beta_3 - p(k_4\delta_3 + \beta_3) \neq 0, \ \forall\, p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.11)$$

then the leading term of $\mathrm{ad}_u^q(x^{n\beta})$ is $\prod_{p=0}^{q-1} b_p x^{n\beta+q(\beta+\sigma), q(\vec{k}-1_{[4]})}$ and u is not *ad*-locally finite. If $(\beta, \vec{k}) = (0, 1_{[4]})$, if necessary we can reverse the order of Γ so that $\delta > \sigma > 0$, and still $(0, 1_{[4]})$ is the maximal element in M_0, then the leading term of $\mathrm{ad}_u^q(x^{\sigma, 1_{[4]}})$ is $q!\delta_3^q x^{(q+1)\delta, 1_{[4]}}$, and u is not *ad*-locally finite. Thus $i_4 = 0$ for all $(\alpha, \vec{i}) \in M_0$. Similarly $i_2 = 0$ for $(\alpha, \vec{i}) \in M_0$.

The proof of case (iii) is similar. This proves the claim.

By Claim 1, $\pi_4 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \pi'_4 = 0$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1: $\pi_4 \neq 0$. Claim 1 shows that $\theta(\mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{F}$. Thus

$$\theta(1) = a \text{ for some } a \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}. \quad (3.12)$$

So, θ must map $\mathcal{B}^{(0)} = \oplus_{\lambda\in\pi_4(\Gamma)}\mathcal{B}_\lambda^{(0)}$, which is the span of eigenvectors of ad_1 (cf. (2.4)), onto $\mathcal{B}'^{(0)}$, and there is a bijection $\tau_4 : \lambda \mapsto \lambda'$ from $\pi_4(\Gamma) \to \pi'_4(\Gamma')$ such that $\theta(\mathcal{B}_\lambda^{(0)}) = \mathcal{B}'^{(0)}_{\lambda'}$ and $\theta(\mathcal{B}_0^{(0)}) = \mathcal{B}'^{(0)}_0$. Since $J_4 = \{0\} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{ad}_1$ is semi-simple, we have $J_4 = J'_4$.

Denote $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{B}_0^{(0)}$. Using (2.3), as in (2.4), for $\eta \in \pi_2(\Gamma)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{C}_\eta^{(m)} = \{u \in \mathcal{C} \mid (\mathrm{ad}_{x^{-\sigma}} - \eta)^{m+1}(u) = 0\} = \mathcal{B} \bigcap \mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \mid \alpha_2 = \eta, i_2 \leq m, \alpha_4 = i_4 = 0\}, \\
&\mathcal{C}^{(m)} = \bigoplus_{\eta\in\pi_2(\Gamma)} \mathcal{C}_\eta^{(m)}, \quad \mathcal{C}_\eta = \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_\eta^{(m)}, \quad \text{then } \mathcal{C} = \bigoplus_{\eta\in\pi_2(\Gamma)} \mathcal{C}_\eta.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Note that for the bracket in $\mathcal{C}$, the last 6 terms of the right-hand side of (2.1) vanish. Denote the center of $\mathcal{C}$ by $C(\mathcal{C}) = \mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \mid \alpha = (\alpha_3)_{[3]}, \vec{i} = (i_3)_{[3]}\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ (cf. (2.5)). As in the proof of Claim 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{C}_F = \mathbb{F}x^{-\sigma} + C(\mathcal{C}) = \mathrm{span}\{x^{-\sigma}, x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \mid \alpha = (\alpha_3)_{[3]}, \vec{i} = (i_3)_{[3]}\} \text{ if } \pi_2 \neq 0, \text{ or} \\
&\mathcal{C}_F = \mathcal{C}_0^{(0)} = \mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \mid (\alpha_2, \alpha_4) = (i_2, i_4) = 0\} \text{ if } \pi_2 = 0.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Thus $\pi_2 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}_F$ has elements which are not *ad*-locally nilpotent on $\mathcal{C} \Leftrightarrow \pi'_2 = 0$.

Subcase (i): $\pi_2\neq 0$. Then (3.14) shows that $\pi'_2\neq 0$, and $J_2=J'_2$ since $J_2=\{0\}\Leftrightarrow\mathcal{C}_F$ has *ad*-semi-simple elements, and we can suppose

$$\theta(x^{-\sigma})=by^{-\sigma}+u_{-\sigma} \text{ for some } b\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\} \text{ and } u_{-\sigma}\in C(\mathcal{C}), \tag{3.15}$$

and by (2.3), θ maps $\mathcal{C}^{(0)}=\oplus_{\eta\in\pi_2(\Gamma)}\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_\eta$, onto $\mathcal{C}'^{(0)}$, and there is a bijection $\tau_2:\eta\mapsto\eta'$ from $\pi_2(\Gamma)\to\pi'_2(\Gamma')$ such that $\theta(\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_\eta)=\mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_{\eta'}$ and $\theta(\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_0)=\mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_0$. Furthermore, $\theta(\mathcal{C}^{(1)}_0)=\mathcal{C}'^{(1)}_0$. Thus $\theta(t_2)=ct'_2+u$ for some $c\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$ and $u\in\mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_0$. Applying θ to $[t_2,x^{-\sigma}]=1$, by (3.12), (3.15), $c=ab^{-1}$. Note that $\partial_{t'_2}: y^{\alpha',\vec{i}}\mapsto i_2y^{\alpha',\vec{i}-1_{[2]}}$ is a derivation of $\mathcal{B}'$ if $J'_2\neq\{0\}$. If $J'_2=\{0\}$, we set $\partial_{t'_2}=0$. The isomorphism θ induces a Lie isomorphism of the derivation algebra of $\mathcal{B}$ onto the derivation algebra of $\mathcal{B}'$. If $J'_2\neq\{0\}$, we have $(\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}))(\mathcal{C}^{(0)})=\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}(\theta(\mathcal{C}^{(0)})))=\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}(\mathcal{C}'^{(0)}))=0$ (cf. (3.13)), and $(\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}))(t_2)=\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}(\theta(t_2)))=\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}(ct'_2+u))=\theta^{-1}(c)=b^{-1}$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is generated by $\mathcal{C}^{(0)}$ and t_2, and a derivation is determined by its actions on generators, we obtain $\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2})|_{\mathcal{C}}=b^{-1}\partial_{t_2}|_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Claim 2. $\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2})=b^{-1}\partial_{t_2}$.

If $J_2=\{0\}$, the claim holds trivially. Assume that $J_2\neq\{0\}$. So $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A}$ by Theorem 2.1. Set $d=\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2})-b^{-1}\partial_{t_2}$. Then $d(\mathcal{C})=0$. For $(\beta,\vec{j})\in\Gamma\times J$ with $\beta_4=\lambda\neq 0, j_4=0$, suppose

$$d(x^{\beta,\vec{j}})=\sum_{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_{\beta,\vec{j}}} b^{(\beta,\vec{j})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}}x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}} \text{ for some } b^{(\beta,\vec{j})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}}\in\mathbb{F}, \tag{3.16}$$

where $M_{\beta,\vec{j}}=\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times\mathbb{Z}^4\,|\,\vec{i}+\vec{j}\in J,\ b^{(\beta,\vec{j})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}}\neq 0\}$ is finite. Applying d to $[1,x^{\beta,\vec{j}}]=\lambda x^{\beta,\vec{j}}$, using $d(1)=0$, we obtain

$$\alpha_4=i_4=0 \text{ for } (\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_{\beta,\vec{j}}. \tag{3.17}$$

Let $m\in\mathbb{Z}$ and let $(\gamma,\vec{k})\in\Gamma\times J$ be fixed with $\gamma_4=k_4=0$. Denote $u_m=\mathrm{ad}_{x^{-(m+2)\delta+\gamma,\vec{k}}}\mathrm{ad}_{x^{m\delta}}$. We have $[x^{m\delta},x^{\beta,\vec{j}}]=m\delta_3\lambda x^{\beta+(m+1)\delta,\vec{j}}+\lambda x^{\beta+m\delta,\vec{j}}$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}
u_m(x^{\beta,\vec{j}})=\,&m\delta_3\lambda((\gamma_1\beta_2-\beta_1\gamma_2)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}}+(\gamma_1j_2-k_2\beta_1)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[2]}}\\
&\quad+(k_1\beta_2-\gamma_2j_1)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}}+(k_1j_2-j_1k_2)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}-1_{[2]}}\\
&\quad+(-(m+2)\delta_3+\gamma_3)\lambda x^{\beta+\gamma,\vec{j}+\vec{k}}+k_3\lambda x^{\beta+\gamma,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[3]}}+\lambda x^{\beta+\gamma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}})\\
&+\lambda((\gamma_1\beta_2-\beta_1\gamma_2)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-2\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}}+(\gamma_1j_2-k_2\beta_1)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-2\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[2]}}\\
&\quad+(k_1\beta_2-\gamma_2j_1)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-2\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}}+(k_1j_2-j_1k_2)x^{\beta+\gamma+\sigma-2\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}-1_{[2]}}\\
&\quad+(-(m+2)\delta_3+\gamma_3)\lambda x^{\beta+\gamma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}}+k_3\lambda x^{\beta+\gamma-\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}-1_{[3]}}+\lambda x^{\beta+\gamma-2\delta,\vec{j}+\vec{k}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

From this, by setting $v_m=(2\delta_3^2\lambda^2)^{-1}(u_m-2u_{m-1}+u_{m-2})$, we obtain $v_m(x^{\beta,\vec{j}})=x^{\beta+\gamma,\vec{j}+\vec{k}}$ for all $x^{\beta,\vec{j}}\in\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_\lambda$. Applying d to it, noting that d commutes with v_m since $d(\mathcal{C})=0$, by

(3.16), (3.17), it gives

$$b^{(\beta,\vec{j})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}} = b^{(\beta+\gamma,\vec{j}+\vec{k})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}} \text{ for all } (\beta,\vec{j}),(\gamma,\vec{k}) \in \Gamma\times J \text{ with } \beta_4=\lambda,\ j_4=\gamma_4=k_4=0. \tag{3.19}$$

This shows that $b^{(\beta,\vec{j})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}}$ and $M_{\beta,\vec{j}}$ only depend on λ for all $(\beta,\vec{j})$ with $\beta_4=\lambda, j_4=0$. In particular by setting $\vec{j}=0$, it gives $\vec{i}\in J$ if $(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_{\beta,\vec{j}}$. Set $w_\lambda=\sum_{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_{\beta,\vec{j}}} b^{(\beta,\vec{j})}_{\alpha,\vec{i}} x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{C}$, then (3.16) gives

$$d(u) = w_\lambda u \text{ for all } u\in\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_\lambda, \tag{3.20}$$

(recall (1.3) for the multiplication on $\mathcal{A}$). Thus $d^n(u) = w_\lambda^n u$ for $n\in\mathbb{N}$. But d is locally nilpotent, we obtain $w_\lambda=0$, i.e., $d=0$. If $J_4\neq\{0\}$, replacing $\vec{j}$ by $\vec{j}+1_{[4]}$ in the discussions above, noting that all equations hold under $\mathrm{mod}\,\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_\lambda$ (for example, $[1,x^{\beta,\vec{j}+1_{[4]}}]\equiv\beta_4 x^{\beta,\vec{j}+1_{[4]}}\ (\mathrm{mod}\,\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_\lambda)$ and (3.18) holds under $\mathrm{mod}\,\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_\lambda$), we conclude that $d(x^{\beta,\vec{j}+1_{[4]}})=0$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is generated by $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}$, we obtain $d=0$. This proves Claim 2.

Observe that $\partial_2^*: x^{\beta,\vec{j}}\mapsto\beta_2 x^{\beta,\vec{j}}$ for $x^{\beta,\vec{j}}\in\mathcal{B}$, is also a derivation of $\mathcal{B}$. Similar to the proof of Claim 2, we obtain

$$(\theta^{-1}(\partial'^*_2))(u) = b^{-1}\partial^*_2(u) + c_\lambda u \text{ for } u\in\mathcal{B}_\lambda \text{ and some } c_\lambda\in\mathbb{F}. \tag{3.21}$$

Denote by π_{24} the natural projection $\alpha\mapsto(\alpha_2,\alpha_4)$. For $(\eta,\lambda)\in\pi_{24}(\Gamma)$, denote $\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}=\mathcal{B}\cap\mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,\pi_{24}(\alpha)=(\eta,\lambda),(i_2,i_4)=0\}$. Then the nonzero vectors in $\cup_{(\eta,\lambda)\in\pi_{24}(\Gamma)}\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}$ are the only common eigenvectors of $\mathrm{ad}_1,\partial_{t_2},\partial^*_2$. From (3.12), Claim 2 and (3.21), we see that θ maps common eigenvectors of $\mathrm{ad}_1,\partial_{t_2},\partial^*_2$ to common eigenvectors of $\mathrm{ad}_1,\partial_{t'_2},\partial'^*_2$. Thus there is a bijection $\tau_{24}:\pi_{24}(\Gamma)\to\pi'_{24}(\Gamma')$ such that $\theta(\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda})=\mathcal{B}'_{\tau_{24}(\eta,\lambda)}$.

Claim 3. If $(\eta,\lambda)\neq0$, then $\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}$ is a cyclic module over $\mathcal{B}_{0,0}=\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_0$ (cf. (3.13)), the nonzero scalars of x^α, $\forall\,\alpha\in\Gamma$ with $(\alpha_2,\alpha_4)=(\eta,\lambda)$ are the only generators.

Let $u=\sum_{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0} c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}$, where $M_0=\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in\Gamma\times J\,|\,(\alpha_2,\alpha_4)=(\eta,\lambda),i_2=i_4=0,c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}\neq0\}$ is finite. If $|M_0|>1$ or M_0 is a singleton $\{(\alpha,\vec{i})\}$ with $\vec{i}\neq0$, then $U=\mathrm{span}\{x^{\beta,\vec{j}}u=\sum_{(\alpha,\vec{i})\in M_0} c_{\alpha,\vec{i}}x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}}\,|\,(\beta,\vec{j})\in\Gamma\times J,(\beta_2,\beta_4)=(j_2,j_4)=0\}$ is a proper $\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_0$-submodule of $\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}$, which contains $\langle u\rangle$ (the submodule generated by u), so u is not a generator of $\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}$ as a $\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_0$-module. Suppose $M_0=\{(\alpha,0)\}$ is a singleton with $(\alpha_2,\alpha_4)=(\eta,\lambda)$. Assume that $\lambda\neq0$. By (2.7), $x^{-k\delta}\in\mathcal{C}^{(0)}_0$ for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, we have $[x^{-k\delta},x^\alpha]=\lambda(k\delta_3x^{\alpha+(1-k)\delta}+x^{\alpha-k\delta})\in\langle u\rangle$, thus $x^{\alpha-k\delta}\in\langle u\rangle$, and

$$v_k=[(\gamma_3+k\delta_3)x^{\gamma+(k+1)\delta,\vec{i}}+i_3x^{\gamma+(k+1)\delta,\vec{i}-1_{[3]}}+2x^{\gamma+k\delta,\vec{i}},x^{\alpha-(k+2)\delta}]\in\langle u\rangle, \tag{3.22}$$

(cf. (2.5)) for $k\in\mathbb{N},(\gamma_2,\gamma_4)=(i_2,i_4)=0$. Note that v_k is a polynomial on k with coefficients in $\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_\lambda$, computing the coefficient of k^2 shows that $x^{\alpha+\gamma,\vec{i}}\in\langle u\rangle$, $\forall\,(\gamma,\vec{i})$ with

$(\gamma_2,\gamma_4)=(i_2,i_4)=0$, but $\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}$ is spanned by such elements, thus $\mathcal{B}_{\eta,\lambda}=\langle u\rangle$. If $\lambda=0\neq\eta$, we obtain the same result by replacing δ by σ in the arguments above.

By Claim 3 and that $\theta(\mathcal{C}_0^{(0)})={\mathcal{C}'}_0^{(0)}$ (cf. the statement after (3.15)), there is a bijection $\tau:\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_{24}}\to\Gamma'\backslash\ker_{\pi'_{24}}$ such that

$$\theta(x^\alpha)=c_\alpha y^{\alpha'} \text{ for } \alpha\in\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_{24}} \text{ and some } c_\alpha\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}, \tag{3.23}$$

where when there is no confusion, we denote $\tau(\alpha)$ by α' (but we can not denote $\tau(\delta)$ by δ' since δ' is the corresponding element of δ in $\mathcal{B}'$). Using this and (3.12), we have $\alpha_4 c_\alpha y^{\alpha'}=\theta([1,x^\alpha])=[a,c_\alpha y^{\alpha'}]=ac_\alpha\alpha'_4y^{\alpha'}$, i.e.,

$$\alpha_4=a\alpha'_4, \tag{3.24}$$

for all $\alpha\in\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_{24}}$. For $\alpha,\beta,\alpha+\beta\in\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_{24}}$, applying θ to $[x^\alpha,x^\beta]$, by (3.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&(\alpha_1\beta_2-\beta_1\alpha_2)c_{\alpha+\beta+\sigma}y^{\tau(\alpha+\beta+\sigma)}+(\alpha_3\beta_4-\beta_3\alpha_4)c_{\alpha+\beta+\delta}y^{\tau(\alpha+\beta+\delta)}+(\beta_4-\alpha_4)c_{\alpha+\beta}y^{\tau(\alpha+\beta)}\\&=c_\alpha c_\beta((\alpha'_1\beta'_2-\beta'_1\alpha'_2)y^{\alpha'+\beta'+\sigma}+a^{-1}(\alpha'_3\beta_4-\beta'_3\alpha_4)y^{\alpha'+\beta'+\delta'}+a^{-1}(\beta_4-\alpha_4)y^{\alpha'+\beta'}),\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

we obtain that $y^{\tau(\alpha+\beta)}$ must be one of $y^{\alpha'+\beta'+\sigma},y^{\alpha'+\beta'+\delta'},y^{\alpha'+\beta'}$, i.e.,

$$\tau(\alpha+\beta)=\alpha'+\beta'+k_{\alpha,\beta}\sigma+m_{\alpha,\beta}\delta',\ \text{ where } k_{\alpha,\beta},m_{\alpha,\beta}\in\{0,1\} \text{ if } \beta_4\neq\alpha_4. \tag{3.26}$$

Applying θ to $[x^{-\alpha},x^\alpha]=2\alpha_4$ with $\alpha_4\neq0$, denoting $\beta'=\tau(-\alpha)$, using (3.12), (3.24), we obtain

$$c_{-\alpha}c_\alpha(\beta'_1\alpha'_2-\alpha'_1\beta'_2)y^{\beta'+\alpha'+\sigma}+(\beta'_3+\alpha'_3)a^{-1}\alpha_4y^{\beta'+\alpha'+\delta'}+2a^{-1}\alpha_4y^{\beta'+\alpha'})=2a\alpha_4. \tag{3.27}$$

This shows that $\tau(-\alpha)=-\alpha'$. From this and (3.26), $(-\alpha')+(-\beta')+k_{-\alpha,-\beta}\sigma+m_{-\alpha,-\beta}\delta'=\tau((-\alpha)+(-\beta))=\tau(-(\alpha+\beta))=-\tau(\alpha+\beta)=-(\alpha'+\beta'+k_{\alpha,\beta}\sigma+m_{\alpha,\beta}\delta')$, i.e., $k_{\alpha,\beta}=m_{\alpha,\beta}=0$. Hence $\tau(\alpha+\beta)=\tau(\alpha)+\tau(\beta)$ and τ can be uniquely extended to a group isomorphism $\tau:\Gamma\cong\Gamma'$, so (3.24) holds for all $\alpha\in\Gamma$. By comparing the coefficient of $y^{\alpha'+\beta'}$ in (3.25), we obtain $c_\alpha c_\beta=c_{\alpha+\beta}a$ and so $\chi:\alpha\mapsto a^{-1}c_\alpha$ can be uniquely extended to a multiplicative function: $\Gamma\to\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$, and the first terms of both sides of (3.25) then show that $\tau(\sigma)=\sigma$, similarly, $\tau(\delta)=\delta'$. Fix $\gamma\in\ker_{\pi_4}\backslash\ker_{\pi_2}$ (cf. (1.1)). By (3.24) $\gamma'_4=0$, thus by (3.23) $2\gamma_2\theta(x^{-\sigma})=\theta([x^{\gamma-\sigma},x^{-\gamma-\sigma}])=c_{\gamma-\sigma}c_{-\gamma-\sigma}[y^{\gamma'-\sigma},y^{-\gamma'-\sigma}]=2c_{-\sigma}^2\gamma'_2y^{-\sigma}$. Comparing this with (3.15), we obtain $b=c_{-\sigma}^2\gamma'_2\gamma_2$ and $u_{-\sigma}=0$ in (3.15). Using this, for any $\alpha\in\Gamma$ with $\alpha_2\neq0$, applying θ to $[x^{-\sigma},x^\alpha]=-\alpha_2x^\alpha-\alpha_4x^{\alpha-\sigma+\delta}+\alpha_4x^{\alpha-\sigma}$, by (3.23), (3.24), we have $-\alpha_2c_\alpha=-bc_\alpha\alpha'_2$, i.e.,

$$\alpha_2=b\alpha'_2, \tag{3.28}$$

which must hold for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$ since τ is an isomorphism. Now fix $\beta \in \Gamma$ with $\beta_2 \neq 0 \neq \beta_4$, for $\alpha \in \Gamma$ with $\alpha, \alpha+\beta \in \Gamma \backslash \ker_{\pi_{24}}$, using $c_{\alpha+\beta+\sigma} = c_\alpha c_\beta c_\sigma a^{-2}$, then (3.24), (3.28) and the first two terms of both sides of (3.25) show that

$$\alpha'_1 = c_\sigma a^{-2} b \alpha_1 + (-\beta_1 c_\sigma a^{-2} b + \beta'_1)\beta_2^{-1}\alpha_2,\ \alpha'_3 = c_\delta a^{-1}\alpha_3 + (-\beta_3 c_\delta a^{-1} + \beta'_3)\beta_4^{-1}\alpha_4, \quad (3.29)$$

which must also hold for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$ since τ is an isomorphism. Since $\tau(\sigma) = \sigma$, (3.29) shows that the coefficients of α_1, α_3 must be 1, i.e., $c_\sigma a^{-2} b = c_\delta a^{-1} = 1$. Denote by a_1, a_3 the coefficients of α_2, α_4 respectively, and set $a_2 = b^{-1}, a_4 = a^{-1}$, then (3.29), (3.24), (3.28) give (3.2) as required.

We already proved $(J_2, J_4) = (J'_2, J'_4)$. Assume that $J_1 \neq \{0\} = J'_1$. Then we can find $t_1 = x^{0,1_{[1]}} \in \mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}$ (cf. (3.13)) with $[t_1, x^\gamma] = \gamma_1 x^{\gamma+\sigma}$, where $\gamma \in \ker_{\pi_4} \backslash \ker_{\pi_2}$ is as above, but we can not find $u' \in \mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_0$ with $[u', y^{\gamma'}] = y^{\gamma'+\sigma}$ because for any $y^{\alpha', \vec{i}} \in \mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_0$, $[y^{\alpha',\vec{i}}, y^{\gamma'}] = (\alpha'_1\gamma'_2 - \alpha'_2\gamma'_1) y^{\gamma'+\alpha'+\sigma}$ can not produce a nonzero term $y^{\gamma'+\sigma}$. This is a contradiction. Thus $J_1 = J'_1$. Similarly $J_3 = J'_3$. This proves $J = J'$. Next we prove $a_1 = 0$ if $J_1 = \{0\} \neq J_2$ as follows. Consider $\theta(x^{\gamma,1_{[2]}})$. As in the statement after (3.15), $\theta(\mathcal{C}_\eta^{(1)}) = \mathcal{C}'^{(1)}_{\eta'}$, and since $\partial_{t_2}(x^{\gamma,1_{[2]}}) = x^\gamma$, using Claim 2, we can write $\theta(x^{\gamma,1_{[2]}}) = u' + a' y^{\gamma',1_{[2]}}$ for some $u' \in \mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_{\eta'}$ and $a' = c_\gamma b^{-1}$. Then $\gamma_1 c_{2\gamma+\sigma} y^{2\gamma'+\sigma} = \theta([x^\gamma, x^{\gamma,1_{[2]}}]) = c_\gamma([y^{\gamma'}, u'] + a'\gamma'_1 y^{2\gamma'+\sigma})$, but there does not exists $u' \in \mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_{\eta'}$ such that $[y^{\gamma'}, u'] = y^{2\gamma'+\sigma}$. Thus we must have $\gamma_1 c_{2\gamma+\sigma} = c_\gamma a' \gamma'_1 = c_\gamma^2 b^{-1}\gamma'_1$, i.e., $\gamma_1 = \gamma'_1$. Since $\gamma'_1 = \gamma_1 + a_1\gamma_2$, it gives $a_1 = 0$. Similarly, if $J_3 = \{0\} \neq J_4$, then $a_3 = 0$. This proves the theorem in this subcase.

Subcase (ii): $\pi_2 = 0$. First a remark: a_1 in (3.2) does not affect the action of τ, so we can always take $a_1 = 0$. (3.14) shows that $\pi'_2 = 0$ and $J_2 = J'_2 = \mathbb{N}$ by (1.2). So $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{A}'$ by Theorem 2.1. (3.14) also shows that $\theta(\mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}) = \mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_0$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}$ is the maximal subspace U of $\mathcal{C}$ such that $[\mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}, U] \subset \mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}$ (cf. (3.13)), thus we have $\theta(\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}) = \mathcal{C}'^{(1)}_0$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}$ is an abelian ideal of $\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}$. Take the quotient Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}/\mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}$. We use an overbar to denote elements in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$, then

$$[\bar{x}^{\gamma,\vec{k}+1_{[2]}}, \bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}}] = (\gamma_1 - \alpha_1)\bar{x}^{\gamma+\alpha+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{k}+1_{[2]}} + (k_1 - i_1)\bar{x}^{\gamma+\alpha+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{k}-1_{[1]}+1_{[2]}}, \quad (3.30)$$

for $(\gamma, \vec{k}), (\alpha, \vec{i}) \in \Gamma \times J$ with $\gamma_4 = \alpha_4 = k_2 = k_4 = i_2 = i_4 = 0$. As in the proof of Claim 1, we obtain that the set of *ad*-locally finite elements in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ is $\mathbb{F}\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$, and that $\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$ is *ad*-semi-simple $\Leftrightarrow J_1 = \{0\}$. Since $\theta(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) = \bar{\mathcal{C}}'$, we obtain $J_1 = J'_1$ and we can write

$$\theta(x^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}) \equiv a_0 y^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}} \ (\mathrm{mod}\, \mathcal{C}'^{(0)}_0) \text{ for some } a_0 \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}. \quad (3.31)$$

For $\lambda \in \pi_1(\Gamma)$, let $\mathcal{C}_{0,\lambda}^{(0)} = \mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{C}_0^{(0)} \,|\, \alpha_1 = \lambda, i_1 = 0\}$, and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\lambda = \mathrm{span}\{\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \,|\, \alpha_1 = \lambda, i_1 = 0\}$. Then $(\cup_{\lambda\in\pi_1(\Gamma)}\mathcal{C}_{0,\lambda}^{(0)})\backslash\{0\}$ (resp. $(\cup_{\lambda\in\pi_1(\Gamma)}\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\lambda)\backslash\{0\}$) is the set of eigenvectors of $\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$ in $\mathcal{C}_0^{(0)}$ (resp. $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$), we see that there is a bijection $\tau_p : \pi_1(\Gamma) \to \pi'_1(\Gamma')$, $p = 1, 2$

such that $\theta(\mathcal{C}_{0,\lambda}^{(0)}) = {\mathcal{C}'}_{0,\tau_1(\lambda)}^{(0)}$ and $\theta(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\lambda) = \bar{\mathcal{C}}'_{\tau_2(\lambda)}$. For $0 \neq \lambda \in \pi_1(\Gamma)$, as in the proof of Claim 3, we obtain that the nonzero scalars of x^α (resp. $\bar{x}^{\alpha,1_{[2]}}$), $\forall\, a \in \Gamma$ with $\alpha_1 = \lambda, \alpha_4 = 0$, are the only generators of $\mathcal{C}_{0,\lambda}^{(0)}$ (resp. $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\lambda$) as a $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_0$-module. Thus, there is a bijection $\tau_p : \ker_{\pi_4} \backslash \ker_{\pi_1} \to \ker_{\pi'_4} \backslash \ker_{\pi'_1}, p = 3, 4$ such that

$$\theta(x^\alpha) = c_\alpha y^{\tau_3(\alpha)}, \quad \theta(x^{\alpha,1_{[2]}}) \equiv c'_\alpha y^{\tau_4(\alpha),1_{[2]}} \,(\mathrm{mod}\, {\mathcal{C}'}_0^{(0)}), \tag{3.32}$$

for $\alpha \in \ker_{\pi_4} \backslash \ker_{\pi_1}$ and some $c_\alpha, c'_\alpha \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$. Applying θ to $\alpha_1 x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma} = [x^\alpha, x^{\beta,1_{[2]}}]$, and to $(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,1_{[2]}} = [x^{\alpha,1_{[2]}}, x^{\beta,1_{[2]}}]$, we obtain $\tau_3(\alpha + \beta + \sigma) = \tau_3(\alpha) + \tau_4(\beta) + \sigma$, $\alpha_1 c_{\alpha+\beta+\sigma} = (\tau_3(\alpha))_1 c_\alpha c'_\beta$, and $\tau_4(\alpha + \beta + \sigma) = \tau_4(\alpha) + \tau_4(\beta) + \sigma$, $(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) c'_{\alpha+\beta+\sigma} = ((\tau_4(\alpha))_1 - (\tau_4(\beta))_1) c'_\alpha c'_\beta$. From this we obtain that $\tau_3 = \tau_4$ can be uniquely extended to an isomorphism $\tau_3 : \ker_{\pi_4} \cong \ker_{\pi'_4}$ such that $\tau_3(\sigma) = \sigma$ and by setting $\alpha = -\sigma$, we obtain $c_\beta = c_{-\sigma} c'_\beta$, and setting $\beta = -\sigma$ gives $c'_{-\sigma} = 1$, i.e., $a_0 = 1$ by (3.31). Now as in the arguments before Claim 2, we have $\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2})|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}} = b^{-1}\partial_{t_2}|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}}$ for some b (a remark: since in this subcase, $\mathcal{C}$ is not generated by $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, we can only obtain $\theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2})|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}} = b^{-1}\partial_{t_2}|_{\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}}$). Then exactly similar to the proof of Claim 2, by letting $d = \theta^{-1}(\partial_{t'_2}) - b^{-1}\partial_{t_2}$, we obtain $d|_{\mathcal{B}^{(0)}} = 0$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is generated by $\mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(0)}$, we obtain $d = 0$. By considering the common eigenvectors of $\mathrm{ad}_1, \partial_{t_2}$, we see that the rest of the proof in this subcase is the same as that of Subcase (i)

Case 2: $\pi_4 = 0$. In this case a_3 in (3.2) does not affect the action of τ, so we can always take $a_3 = 0$. By Claim 1, $\pi'_4 = 0$ and so $J_4 = J'_4 = \mathbb{N}$ by (1.2).

Subcase (i): $\pi_2 = 0$ (and so we can take $a_1 = 0$ in (3.2)). Denote $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{B}_F = \mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \mid i_2 = i_4 = 0\}, \mathcal{C}_1 = \{u \in \mathcal{B} \mid [u, \mathcal{C}_0] \subset \mathcal{C}_0\} = \mathrm{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}} \mid i_2 + i_4 \leq 1\}, \bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}_1/\mathcal{C}_0$. Then $\theta(\mathcal{C}_p) = \mathcal{C}'_p, p = 0, 1$ and $\theta(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) = \bar{\mathcal{C}}'$. Denote by $\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}}$ the corresponding element of $x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}$ in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$. Since $\mathcal{C}_0$ is an abelian Lie ideal of $\mathcal{C}_1$, we can regard $\mathcal{C}_0$ as a $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$-module.

Claim 4. The nonzero scalars of $\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$ are the only elements in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ acting locally finitely on $\mathcal{C}_0$. The adjoint action of $\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$ on $\mathcal{C}_0$ is a semi-simple operator $\Leftrightarrow J_1 = \{0\}$.

Note that for $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma, \vec{i}, \vec{j} \in J$ with $i_2 = i_4 = j_2 = j_4 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &[\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}}, x^{\beta,\vec{j}}] = -\beta_1 x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{j}} - j_1 x^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[1]}}, \\ &[\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[4]}}, x^{\beta,\vec{j}}] = -\beta_3 x^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}} - j_3 x^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}-1_{[3]}} - x^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+\vec{j}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

From this, the proof of the claim is exactly analogous to that of Claim 1.

By Claim 4, $\exists\, a_0 \neq 0$ such that $\theta(\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}) = a_0 \bar{y}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$, and $J_1 = J'_1$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{0,0} = \{u \in \mathcal{C}_0 \mid [\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}, u] = 0\}$, $\bar{\mathcal{D}} = \{u \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \mid [\mathcal{C}_{0,0}, u] = 0\}$. Then by (3.33), $\mathcal{C}_{0,0} = \mathrm{span}\{x^{\beta,\vec{i}} \in \mathcal{C}_0 \mid \beta_1 = i_1 = i_2 = i_4 = 0\}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}} = \mathrm{span}\{\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \mid i_1 = i_2 = i_4 = 0\}$. For $\lambda \in \pi_1(\Gamma)$, denote $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda =$

$\text{span}\{\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}}\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}\,|\,\alpha_1=\lambda, i_1=i_2=i_4=0\}$. For $(\alpha,\vec{i}),(\gamma,\vec{k})\in\Gamma\times J$ with $(i_2,i_4)=(k_2,k_4)=0$, we have formula (3.30), and we see that $(\cup_{\lambda\in\pi_1(\Gamma)}\bar{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda)\backslash\{0\}$ is the set of eigenvectors of $\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}}$ in $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$. Thus there is a bijection $\tau_1:\pi_1(\Gamma)\to\pi_1'(\Gamma')$ such that $\theta(\bar{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda)=\bar{\mathcal{D}}'_{\tau_1(\lambda)}$ for $\lambda\in\pi_1(\Gamma)$ and $\tau_1(0)=0$. Using (3.30), as in the proof of Claim 3, we have

Claim 5. If $\lambda\neq 0$, then $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda$ is a cyclic module over $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_0$, the nonzero scalars of $\bar{x}^{\alpha,1_{[2]}}$, $\forall\,\alpha\in\Gamma$ with $\alpha_1=\lambda$ are the only generators.

By Claim 5, there is a bijection $\tau:\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_1}\to\Gamma'\backslash\ker_{\pi_1'}$ such that

$$\theta(\bar{x}^{\alpha,1_{[2]}})=c_\alpha\bar{y}^{\tau(\alpha),1_{[2]}}\text{ for }\alpha\in\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_1}\text{ and some }c_\alpha\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}.\tag{3.34}$$

In particular, θ maps $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}$ to $\bar{\mathcal{D}}'^{(0)}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}=\text{span}\{\bar{x}^{\alpha,1_{[2]}}\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}\}$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}=\{u\in\bar{\mathcal{C}}\,|\,[u,\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}]\subset\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}\}$. Then $\theta(\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)})=\bar{\mathcal{D}}'^{(1)}$. By

$$[\bar{x}^{\alpha,\vec{i}+1_{[4]}},\bar{x}^{\beta,1_{[2]}}]=\alpha_1\bar{x}^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}+1_{[4]}}+i_1\bar{x}^{\alpha+\beta+\sigma,\vec{i}-1_{[1]}+1_{[4]}}-\beta_3\bar{x}^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}}-\bar{x}^{\alpha+\beta,\vec{i}+1_{[2]}},\tag{3.35}$$

we obtain $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}=\text{span}\{\bar{x}^{\alpha,1_{[2]}},\bar{x}^{\beta,1_{[4]}}\,|\,\beta_1=0\}$. Using $[\bar{x}^{\alpha,1_{[4]}},\bar{x}^{\beta,1_{[4]}}]=(\alpha_3-\beta_3)\bar{x}^{\alpha+\beta+\delta,1_{[4]}}$, we see that there is a group isomorphism $\tau_3:\ker_{\pi_1}\cong\ker_{\pi_1'}$ such that

$$\theta(\bar{x}^{\beta,1_{[4]}})=e_\beta\bar{y}^{\tau_3(\beta),1_{[4]}}+u_\beta\text{ for }\beta\in\ker_{\pi_1}\text{ and some }e_\beta\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\},u_\beta\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}.\tag{3.36}$$

Similarly to (3.34), set $\mathcal{C}_0^{(\lambda)}=\{u\in\mathcal{C}_0\,|\,[\bar{x}^{-\sigma,1_{[2]}},u]=\lambda u\}=\text{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\in\mathcal{C}_0\,|\,\alpha_1=\lambda,i_1=i_2=i_4=0\}$ for $\lambda\in\pi_1(\Gamma)$, then as above, there is a bijection $\tau_0:\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_1}\to\Gamma'\backslash\ker_{\pi_1'}$ such that

$$\theta(\bar{x}^\alpha)=d_\alpha\bar{y}^{\tau_0(\alpha)}\text{ for }\alpha\in\Gamma\backslash\ker_{\pi_1}\text{ and some }d_\alpha\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}.\tag{3.37}$$

Setting $\vec{i}=\vec{j}=0$ in (3.33), (3.30), (3.35), applying θ to them, using (3.34), (3.36), (3.37), we deduce that $\Gamma=\Gamma'$ and $\tau=\tau_0$ is the identity map. To complete the proof of this subcase, it remains to prove $J_3=J_3'$, which can be done as in the last paragraph of Case 1(i).

Subcase (ii): $\pi_2\neq 0$. For $\eta\in\pi_2(\Gamma)$, denote $\mathcal{B}_\eta=\text{span}\{x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,\alpha_2=\eta,i_2=i_4=0\}$. By Claim 1, $\mathcal{B}_F=\text{span}\{x^{-\sigma},x^{\alpha,\vec{i}}\,|\,\alpha=(\alpha_3)_{[3]},\vec{i}=(i_3)_{[3]}\}$. Thus $(\cup_{\eta\in\pi_2(\Gamma)}\mathcal{B}_\eta)\backslash\{0\}$ is the common eigenvectors of $\mathcal{B}_F$. So there is a bijection $\tau_2:\pi_2(\Gamma)\to\pi_2'(\Gamma')$ such that $\theta(\mathcal{B}_\eta)=\mathcal{B}'_{\tau_2(\eta)}$. The rest of the proof is exactly analogous to that of Case 1(i). ∎

We remark that as in the proof of [18, Theorem 4.2], the Lie algebra $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma,J,\delta)$ is not isomorphic to: a Kac-Moody algebra, a generalized Kac-Moody algebra, a finite root system graded Lie algebra, a generalized Cartan type Lie algebra [8,9,12], a Lie algebra of type L [6], a Xu's Lie algebra [7,11,15], a Zhao's Lie algebra in [18], or a Lie algebra in [10].

We would like to conclude the paper with the following

Problem 3.2. Determine the derivation algebra $\mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{B})$, the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{B})$, and the second cohomology group $H^2(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{F})$.

References

[1] R. Block, "On torsion-free abelian groups and Lie algebras," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **9** (1958), 613-620.

[2] D. Dokovic, K. Zhao, "Derivations, isomorphisms and second cohomology of generalized Block algebras," *Algebra Colloquium*, **3** (1996), 245-272.

[3] D. Dokovic, K. Zhao, "Some infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras related to those of Block," *J. Pure and Applied Algebra*, **127** (1998), 153-165.

[4] D. Dokovic, K. Zhao, "Some simple subalgebras of generalized Block algebras," *J. Alg.*, **192**, 74-101.

[5] J. M. Osborn, K. Zhao, "Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras of generalized Block type," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **127** (1999), 1641-1650.

[6] J. M. Osborn, K. Zhao, "Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras of type L," *Comm. Alg.*, accepted for publication.

[7] Y. Su, "Derivations and structure of the Lie algebras of Xu type," *Manuscripta Math.*, **105** (2001), 483-500.

[8] Y. Su, X. Xu, "Structure of divergence-free Lie algebras," *J. Alg.*, **243** (2001), 557-595.

[9] Y. Su, X. Xu, H. Zhang, "Derivation-simple algebras and the structures of Lie algebras of Witt type," *J. Alg.*, **233** (2000), 642-662.

[10] Y. Su, J. Zhou, "A class of nongraded simple Lie algebras," submitted.

[11] Y. Su, J. Zhou, "Structure of the Lie algebras related to those of Block," *Comm. Alg.*, **30** (2002), 3205-3226.

[12] X. Xu, "New generalized simple Lie algebras of Cartan type over a field with characteristic 0," *J. Alg.*, **224** (2000), 23-58.

[13] X. Xu, "On simple Novikov algebras and their irreducible modules," *J. Alg.*, **185** (1996), 905-934.

[14] X. Xu, "Novikov-Poisson algebras," *J. Alg.*, **190** (1997), 253-279.

[15] X. Xu, "Generalizations of Block algebras," *Manuscripta Math.*, **100** (1999), 489-518.

[16] X. Xu, "Quadratic conformal superalgebras," *J. Alg.*, **224** (2000), 1-38.

[17] X. Xu, "Nongraded infinite-dimensional simple Lie algebras," Preprint 2000.

[18] K. Zhao, "A class of infinite dimensional simple Lie algebras," *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, **62** (2000), 71-84.

[19] K. Zhao, "The q-Virasoro-like algebra," *J. Alg.*, **188** (1997), 506-512.

[20] H. Zhang, K. Zhao, "Representations of the Virasoro-like Lie algebra and its q-analog," *Comm. Alg.*, **24** (1996), 4361-4372.